DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 090 969 95 IR 000 580

AUTHOR	Witt, Paul W. F.
TITLE	An Institute for the Advanced Professional Preparation of Educational Media Specialists. Final Report.
INSTITUTION	Michigan State Univ., East Lansing. Instructional Media Center.
SPONS AGENCY	National Center for Educational Technology (DHEW/OE), Washington, D. C.
BUREAU NO	BR-6-0112
PUB DATE	30 Mar 74
GRANT	OEG-0-72-4376
NOTE	56p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.75 HC-$3.15 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	Curriculum Evaluation; Educational Innovation; Educational Programs; Educational Technology; *Institutes (Training Programs); *Instructional Media; Instructional Technology; *Media Specialists; Participant Satisfaction; Program Descriptions; Seminars
IDENTIFIERS	Educational Technology Training Program; Education Professions Development Act

ABSTRACT

This report describes the activities of an institute for the advanced professional preparation of educational media specialists. It begins with a description of the procedure by which the eight student-participants were selected for this first part of what was designed to be a two year-program leading to the Ed. D or Ph.D degree in instructional development and technology. Orientation sessions, weekly seminars, field trips, and informal social sessions are reviewed, and a list of the speakers who made presentations at the various luncheons and seminars is presented. Other aspects of the institute that are described in the report include: special resource facilities, information resources, funding problems, instructional media, student workrooms, and student evaluations. There is a large set of appendixes in which brochures, participants' backgrounds, seminar activities, speakers, field trips, and evaluation instruments and results are displayed. (Author)

ED 090469

IR

EDUCATION PROFESSIONS DEVELOPMENT ACT

REGULAR MEDIA SPECIALIST PROGRAM

PART D

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

FINAL REPORT

OE: Educational Technology Training Program
National Center for Educational Technology
John D. Colby, Acting Chief
Clarence Fogelstrom, Project Officer

Grant No. OEG-0-72-4376

Project No. 6-0112

Period: 05-10-72 through 06-10-73

Submitted: 03-30-74

Institution: Michigan State University (Instructional Media Center)

Title of Project: An Institute for the Advanced Professional Preparation of Educational Media Specialists.

Project Director: Paul W. F. Witt

This report covers the entire period of the Institute. Consequently, it includes materials previously reported in the progress reports submitted on 12-15-72 and 05-15-73.

1. Major Activities and Accomplishments.

Selection of Participants. The Institute was announced by USOE press releases and a brochure designed by the Institute director. Approximately 1500 copies of the latter were distributed nationwide through the U.S. Mail. They were sent from East Lansing by the Institute director. A copy of the brochure is displayed in Appendix A.

IR 000 580

Forty-three people applied for admission to the Institute. From this group a committee of the MSU faculty in Instructional Development and Technology selected the top eight applicants. All eight accepted invitations to participate and were members of the Institute during its existence. The names and home addresses of the participants, their most recent professional positions and the institutions from which they received their Bachelors' and Masters' degrees including the years in which these degrees were granted are listed in Appendix B. One participant also held the Ed. S. degree.

The only problem encountered in selecting the participants was that three or four very promising applicants could not be invited to participate in the Institute since the grant provided for only eight participants.

Institute Program. The Institute program was designed to be the first year of a two-year, Post-Master's program leading to either the Ed. D. or Ph. D. degree in Instructional Development and Technology. Actually, the total Institute program was comprised of the individual doctoral programs of the eight Institute participants. The major elements of the participants' programs were courses, a special weekly seminar and individually designed guided field experiences. These and other aspects of the Institute program are described below.

Each participant was assigned an adviser who assisted him in selecting his courses and in planning his doctoral program. The advisers

advised the participants in selecting the other three faculty members who served on their guidance committees. Each participant's program was planned in terms of his previous professional preparation and experience and the general requirements for the doctorate in Education at Michigan State University. Each quarter each participant carried approximately 15 to 20 credit hours of course work including three credits for the Institute seminar and three credits for the guided field experience.

Orientation. Prior to the opening of the Fall Term, all Institute participants attended a one-day orientation session that provided them with information about the program and administrative arrangements for the Institute, MSU requirements for the doctorate, registration procedures and other matters of importance to students who are new to MSU. Mrs. Virginia B. Foster, the Institute Secretary, Mr. Arthur L. Savage, Jr., and Mr. Edward P. Caffarella, administrative assistants in Parts D and E Institutes respectively, and Mr. H. James Spooner, coordinator of the curriculum task forces that were an integral part of the previous EPDA Part 5-D Institute, played central roles in orienting the participants to the University , the College, the Area of Specialization and the Institutes. The participants found the orientation session extremely valuable.

Institute Seminar. A major feature of the Institute program was the weekly seminar. The seminar usually met from 9 a. m. to noon on

Fridays and when it was appropriate, a second seminar session was held on Friday afternoons.

Because of a commonality of interest and to expand the resources that participants bring to a seminar, the five participants in the EPDA Part E Institute (Resource Utilization Project) that was directed by Dr. James R. Nord participated regularly in the Institute seminar. Dr. Nord, Mr. Caffarella and Mr. Savage shared with Dr. Paul W. F. Witt, the director of the EPDA Part D Institute, responsibility for planning and directing the seminar. Institute participants were involved in selecting and planning seminar activities. Seminar activities for all three quarters are listed in Appendix C.

Special Resource Persons. To acquaint the Institute participants with Michigan State University faculty and to introduce them to the instructional development concept, several faculty members made presentations before the seminar. The Institute participants had opportunity to hear other faculty members at the weekly student-faculty luncheons.

Four professional educators from off-campus served as resource persons in the Institute seminar. In addition, the Institute participants heard other visitors to MSU speak at the weekly luncheons. Institute participants had opportunities to attend two College of Education convocations that featured nationally known educators. The seminar resource persons and the convocation speakers are named in Appendix D. The luncheon speakers are named in Appendix E.

Instructional Development Institute. During the first week of the Winter Quarter a special Instructional Development Institute (IDI) was conducted for the participants of the two EPDA Institutes. A number of other students in Instructional Development and Technology at MSU and a few visiting educators also participated in the IDI. Dr. Curtis J. McCarty, Dr. Thomas Harries and Mr. James Foster assisted by Mr. Kenneth Kumasawa conducted the IDI. The debriefing of the participants by the IDI staff revealed that the participants not only learned the purposes and nature of an IDI, they learned a great deal about the instructional development process itself. The participants were unanimous in judging the IDI of great value.

RUP Evaluation Project. Five of the eleven seminar sessions during the Winter Quarter were devoted to the evaluation of four training packages. One additional session was spent assessing the experience, evaluating the packages and identifying the quality and potential pedagogical value of the packages. This evaluation activity was an integral part of the EPDA Part E Institute. It was deemed to be of sufficient value to all students preparing to be instructional development (media) specialists to involve the Part D participants in it. The participants selected the package they wished to evaluate and then did so in small teams. Four of the six packages that were made available were evaluated. A description of the evaluation project, the titles and descriptions of the training packages and the names of the students in each group

as well as the titles of the packages evaluated were given in Appendix B of the interim report submitted at the close of the Winter Quarter.

As a result of their experiences in this project, Institute participants obtained a greater understanding of the nature of training packages of the types they evaluated and increased ability to evaluate such instructional materials. Overall, the project was deemed to have been valuable.

Field Trips. To acquaint Institute participants with a variety of instructional development activities, media programs and innovative projects in education, they were taken on a number of field trips. Orientations for these trips and follow-up discussions were conducted during preceding and succeeding seminar sessions. The field trips are listed in Appendix F.

Cognitive Style Mapping. As a follow-up to their field trip to Oakland Community College during the Fall Term, the Institute participants returned to OCC during the Winter Term to take the tests used to map students' cognitive styles. In the Spring Term Dr. Joe Hill, president of OCC and a principal theorist in cognitive style mapping, spent some time with Institute participants at MSU interpreting the maps of the Institute participants' cognitive styles. Through this process the participants gained an excellent understanding of the theory of cognitive style mapping as well as of the procedures used at OCC for making these maps.

Guided Field Experience. Guided field experiences as an instructional media specialist were an essential component of each participant's program. During the first term these experiences were mainly observational in character. They were provided by means of field trips. During the Winter and Spring Quarters the participants became more directly involved in field activities. One participated in development activities in ED200 -- Individual and School, the introductory undergraduate course in Education. Two worked intensively with educators at St. Mary's Hospital in Grand Rapids, Michigan. One worked with the Director of Special Programs in the MSU Center for Supportive Services and Counseling. Under the immediate direction and guidance of a faculty member in Instructional Development and Technology, one assisted a doctor who teaches part-time in the MSU College of Osteopathic Medicine in the design and development of instructional materials. Two participated in activities conducted by professors on the staff of the MSU Office of Medical Education, Research and Development.

Evaluation of EDP Projects. Dr. Allan J. Abedor, assistant director of the Instructional Development Service at Michigan State University, provided Institute participants the opportunity to accompany him on his on-site visits to directors of instructional development projects at MSU which were supported by funds from the MSU Educational Development Program. Following the visits, Dr. Abedor met with the Institute participants to debrief them on these visits, the

purposes of which were to obtain progress reports from the project directors and to determine the extent to which project goals were being realized. The participants' reactions to their experiences with Dr. Abedor as well as Dr. Abedor's observations of the participants' involvement indicated that the participants gained a great deal from the on-site visitations and the debriefings that followed. In addition to learning more about the instructional development process, they gained a clearer and more detailed perception of the Educational Development Program at MSU and the variety of the instructional development projects for which this program provides partial support.

Course Programs. The Institute participants, as full-time doctoral students, carried full course programs each quarter. Included in each participant's program was the Institute seminar (3 quarter hours) and the Laboratory and Field Experiences in Education (3 quarter hours). Each participant selected his courses in consultation with and with the approval of his adviser who was also the chairman of his doctoral guidance committee. The courses selected constituted a part of the participant's doctoral program. The participants' grades in their course work were uniformly high. Their achievement in their courses as in other aspects of their programs was superior.

Student-Staff Luncheons. Weekly on Fridays (the day the Institute seminar was conducted) luncheons for students and faculty in Instructional

Development and Technology were held in a private dining room in one of the living-learning centers on the MSU campus. The programs which were planned and conducted by Mr. Savage and Mr. Caffarella, the two EPDA Institute administrative assistants, featured MSU faculty and administrators, campus visitors and students. Since these luncheon programs were a part of the Institute program, the Institute participants attended regularly. A record of the luncheon speakers is set forth in Appendix E.

Special Lecture Series. During the Winter Term the Institute participants were invited to a series of four lectures on innovations in college instruction. These lectures, sponsored by the MSU Instructional Development Service, are described in Appendix G. Most of the participants attended one or more lectures. They found them most worthwhile.

Participation in Doctoral Research Project. All eight EPDA Part D Institute participants served as subjects in the research Arthur Savage, Jr., the administrative assistant in the Institute, conducted for his doctoral dissertation. Mr. Savage's study was designed to test an instructional strategy intended to increase interpersonal communication skills in doctoral candidates in Instructional Development and Technology. Since the participants were anticipating the time when they would be conducting research for their doctoral dissertations, they found their experiences in Mr. Savage's project educative as well as interesting.

Individual Conferences. During the Fall Term the Institute director held two formal conferences with each participant. These conferences

enabled the director to become acquainted with the participants, to know their professional interests and goals, to clarify their questions and concerns regarding the Institute and their doctoral programs, to explore possible field experiences, to learn their evaluations of the Institute and to obtain their suggestions as to ways to make the Institute of increased value to them. Additional formal conferences were conducted with each participant during both the Winter and Spring Terms. In fact, the final day of the Institute was used for the director to confer individually and leisurely with each participant. Also throughout the year, participants conferred with the director when they felt the need to talk with him personally. These conferences contributed significantly to the development of excellent personal relationships between the participants and the director and enabled both to achieve their objectives more efficiently and effectively.

Social Activities. Early in the Fall Term a "Coffee Hour" was held for the Institute participants to welcome them to MSU and to give them an opportunity to become acquainted with faculty and staff.

A number of other social activities for Institute participants and their spouses were held during the year. Some of these were arranged and conducted by the participants themselves. Two were hosted by the administrative assistant in the EPDA Part E Institute and his wife. Another was hosted by a faculty member in the Office of Medical Education, Research and Development and his wife. A faculty member and his wife also gave a party for faculty and students including the Institute participants.

Arrangements for Institute participants to have coffee for a nominal charge in their workroom and during the seminar were made.

Graduate Students' Workroom. Institute participants were provided desks, file drawers and book shelves in the workroom reserved for graduate students in Instructional Development and Technology. They also had access to an adjacent workroom which was equipped with a duplicator and production equipment. In addition, they availed themselves of a library of books and other references about media and the services of a librarian who was in charge of these materials. The library was adjacent to the workroom. The workroom and the other facilities contributed significantly to the development of a congenial social atmosphere for the participants as well as to their professional development.

Evaluation. At the end of each quarter, the Institute participants' progress in their course work was checked by inspecting their grades. As reported above, their grades were uniformly high, an indication of satisfactory progress in courses.

The formal and informal conferences that the director had with participants provided another means for evaluating their progress and for discovering ways in which to facilitate their progress in their programs.

Observations of their participation in and contributions to the Institute seminar and reports on their field experiences were other means for assessing the participants' progress in the Institute program.

At the end of the Winter Quarter each participant completed a three-page progress report. A copy of this form including a summary of the

participants' responses was included as Appendix F in the interim report made at the end of the Winter Quarter.

At the end of the Spring Quarter participants were asked to express their evaluation of the Institute seminar by completing the MSU Student Instructional Rating System (SIRS) form. A copy of the form is given in Appendix H. The means of the participants' responses to items 1 through 21 are also given in this Appendix. In comparing the SIRS ratings of the five participants in the EPDA Part D Institute who responded to this form with the SIRS ratings of the eleven participants in the previous EPDA Part D Institute who responded to this form in the Spring of 1972 at the end of that two-year Institute it is evident that although both groups rated the seminar very highly, the ratings of the eleven were in most of the first eleven items slightly higher than those of the five. (Since the record of the responses of the eleven to items 12 to 21 are missing, comparisons of ratings on these items are not possible.) The reasons for these differences are not evident. An inspection of the individual ratings suggests the possibility that one of the five was a somewhat more critical rater than most of the other students in both groups. Another possibility may be that the people in the group that had been together for the longer period of time had developed a sentimental attachment to the Institute and its seminar which may have created a halo effect. In any event, it is clear that both groups were quite satisfied with the seminar.

At the end of the Spring Quarter, the time at which the support for the Institute was terminated, the participants responded to two

specially designed forms: a Final Evaluation form and a form entitled Participants' Opinions Regarding Their Achievement of Institute Objectives. Copies of these forms are in Appendix H. Indices of the participants' responses to several of the items in these two forms are recorded on these forms.

A comparison of the responses of the Institute participants to the Final Evaluation form with those of the students who completed this form at the end of the previous two-year Institute show that the responses are generally in the same high range. With regard to some items the ratings of one group are higher than ratings of the other group; with reference to certain other items the other group's responses are higher. However, it is true that the group which included eight individuals who had participated in the Institute from September 1970 to June 1972 submitted ratings that overall were somewhat higher than the group of eight whose participation in the Institute was from September 1972 to June 1973. Again, it is speculated that the longer period of participation coupled with the strong interpersonal relationships that the participants developed over the period from September 1970 to June 1972 may have been the reasons for the somewhat more favorable response of the previous Institute group. Nonetheless, it should be emphasized that the ratings of both groups are very high.

In comparing the opinions of the two Institute groups regarding their achievement of Institute objectives, it is evident that the group that participated in the longer Institute (1970-72) consistently made the

greatest gains in achieving Institute objectives. However, an examination of the levels at which the two groups entered and the levels at which they left the Institutes shows that the group that began in 1970 entered at a lower level than the group that started in 1972 and that the 1970 group left the Institute at a distinctly higher level of achievement than the 1972 group. But this is as it should be since a two-year experience should be more productive than a one-year experience. Nonetheless, it is clearly evident that the 1972-73 institute, like its predecessor, was a highly successful and very productive enterprise. Although the participants lost their financial support a little less than half way through their two-year Post-Master's doctoral programs, all but two have continued their doctoral studies with half-time graduate assistantships in various departments within the University. One was appointed a full-time instructor in MSU's Highway Traffic Safety Center. He is also continuing his doctoral studies on a part-time basis. Another left MSU at the end of the 1973 Summer Term to accept a major position with the National Association of Educational Broadcasters. But he, too, has arranged to complete his doctoral program at a later date. Consequently, even though the support for the eight participants in the EPDA Part D Institute was terminated before they could complete their doctoral studies, it is obvious that the support for one year enabled them to make a substantial start on their doctoral programs and to get established in the University in a way that made it possible for them to secure other types of support so that they could

continue. It seems certain that the EPDA investment in these able and promising people will ultimately result in significant returns in terms of the leadership and service which they will render in the years to come.

2. Problems.

The only departure from the original training plan was the termination of the Institute in June 1973. This action was dictated by the decision of the USOE not to extend the grant. Consequently, as noted above, the participants lost their stipends and dependency allowances before they were halfway through their two-year, Post-Master's doctoral programs. No other problems of major consequence were encountered.

3. Significant Events.

The significant events of this Institute are reported in Section 1 above.

4. Dissemination Activities.

A press release announcing the selection of Institute participants was sent to "home town" newspapers designated by the participants. Copies of the release and the cover letter were included in Appendix E of the interim report submitted on 12-15-72.

As reported above, more than 1500 copies of a brochure announcing the Institute were distributed nationally. The brochure is in Appendix A.

The participants in both EPDA Institutes (Parts D and E) developed an elaborate mediated program (multi-screen and stereo sound) that

that described the professional program in Instructional Development and Technology at MSU and the work of representative ID&T alumni. The students presented this program at the Leadership Training Institute that was conducted in Las Vegas during the Annual AECT Convention. It was very favorably received by the people who attended the LTI.

At the dress rehearsal of the program shortly before the Institute groups departed for Las Vegas, President Clifton R. Wharton, Jr., president of Michigan State University, was present. He was extremely complimentary to the students in his remarks about their program.

In connection with their Institute seminar activities, their course work and their field activities, all members of the Institute were involved in the design and production of a variety of educational materials. Several of them individually or as members of groups, produced several slide-tape programs. Some were involved in the production of training materials. A programed text, audiotapes, a videotape lesson, a design for a competency-based teacher education program in Vocational Education, a self-instructional program for 11 to 13 year-old deaf children, a computer program on the basic uses of CAI in Education and a plan for making the professional program in Instructional Development and Technology a competency-based program are other productions for which Institute participants were responsible or in which they had some part.

5. Materials and Equipment.

Only the common types of audiovisual and office equipment were used. No special problems were encountered.

6. Data Collection.

This project was not designed to collect data. However, information about the participants as doctoral candidates was assembled.

7. Other Activities.

All Institute activities are reported in section 1 above.

8. Staff Utilization.

Responsibilities for joint Institute activities were carried by the two directors, Dr. James R. Nord and Dr. Paul W. F. Witt, and their administrative assistants, Edward P. Caffarella and Arthur L. Savage, Jr. Other MSU faculty members were involved as instructors in courses taken by Institute participants and as members of their doctoral guidance committees of four of the EPDA Part D Institute participants. Dr. Charles F. Schuller served in these capacities for one participant, Dr. James L. Page for another and Dr. Allan J. Abedor for two.

Ms. Lynn Wendt, instructional assistant, served as librarian for the Institute participants. Mmes. Virginia B. Foster, Elaine Bishop and Roberta Grange served as secretaries.

There were no problems.

9. Activities Planned For Next Reporting Period.

None. Since the support for the Institute was not extended by the USOE, the plans for the continuation of the Institute had to be abandoned.

10. Budget.

The final Budget and Financial Report is presented in Appendix I. The unexpended balance is the amount that had been saved for expenditure in the 1973 Summer Term in the expectation that the USOE grant for the Institute would be extended.

Paul W. F. Witt

Paul W. F. Witt
Project Director
March 30, 1974

Michigan State University

AN INSTITUTE FOR THE ADVANCED PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION OF EDUCATIONAL MEDIA SPECIALISTS TO WORK IN Schools and Teacher Training Institutions

1972-73 Academic Year
September 18, 1972 – June 10, 1973

APPENDIX A

AN INSTITUTE FOR THE ADVANCED PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION OF EDUCATIONAL MEDIA SPECIALISTS TO WORK IN SCHOOLS AND TEACHER TRAINING INSTITUTIONS

Offered in Cooperation with
The National Center for
Educational Technology
Media Specialist Program
Office of Education
Education Professions Development Act
Part D

Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 states: "No person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance." Therefore EPDA programs must be operated in compliance with this law.

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY is in compliance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, creed, or national origin.

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY is a land grant institution and lists among its faculty distinguished scholars and educators with national and international reputations.

PURPOSE

The purpose of the Institute program is to prepare instructional media specialists to work in schools and teacher training institutions. The program is designed so special emphasis will be given to the work of the instructional media specialist in preservice and inservice teacher training, vocational education, and the education of the disadvantaged from both rural and urban areas.

OBJECTIVES

The Institute program is designed to enable those who complete it successfully:

1. To utilize systems analysis and design in identifying and studying instructional problems, in establishing objectives, in developing new teaching strategies and materials for problem solutions and in designing and applying appropriate instructional media in the process.
2. To evaluate and use effectively all types of instructional media.
3. To design, direct the production of and validate graphic and pictorial instructional materials.
4. To design and conduct evaluation studies to determine the pedagogical as well as the cost effectiveness of teaching strategies and instructional materials.
5. To work effectively with teachers and with the trainers of teachers on the planning of teaching strategies and the selection, design and use of media.

PROGRAM

The Institute program for 1972-73 is designed to be the first year of a two-year, Post-Master's program leading to either the Ed.D. or Ph.D. degree. Each participant's program will be planned in terms of his previous professional preparation and experience and the general requirements for the doctorate at MSU.

Guided experiences as an instructional media specialist (i.e., an internship) will be an essential component of each participant's program. At the outset, these experiences will be mainly observational in character. Later, the participants will become increasingly involved with greater responsibility. They will work with pupils as well as teachers. Their involvement will be with specific reference to media and the professional activities of the media specialist. At all times they will work under the guidance of the MSU faculty in Instructional Development and Technology. Guided field experiences will be a part of the participants' programs each term.

Another feature of the proposed program is a seminar which the participants will attend weekly throughout the entire academic year. The seminar will be conducted by the Director of the program. Other MSU faculty members will participate. The seminar will focus on the role of the media specialist in the improvement of instruction and the development of curriculum. It will be the instrumentality through which the faculty will help the participants understand the significance of their guided field experiences and the relationship of these experiences to the other components of the program. Through the seminar the Director and his associates will help the participants integrate and unify their program experiences.

INTRA- AND INTERINSTITUTIONAL COOPERATION

Local school districts as well as several units within Michigan State University will provide opportunities for the participants' guided field experiences.

ELIGIBILITY

The Institute is designed for eight (8) participants who are engaged in doctoral study at the Post-Master's degree level. Participants will be required to be in residence at Michigan State University for the 1972-73 academic year and to devote full-time to the Institute program.

Applicants will be accepted from:

- Audio-visual specialists and librarians
- Elementary and secondary school teachers, supervisors and administrators
- Vocational school teachers and administrators
- Community college teachers and administrators
- Teacher trainers (both preservice and inservice)
- Television, radio, and film producers, directors and writers
- Psychologists and systems analysts

The factors that will be taken into account in selecting the participants are:

Verbal score on the MAT or GRE

In general, an applicant will be expected to have a score above the 50th percentile.

Previous education

A Master's degree or equivalent will be required. Applicants with work beyond the Master's degree will be eligible for admission provided they have at least one year of additional course work to complete on a doctoral program.

Teaching experience

A minimum of two years of teaching experience will be required.

Professional recommendations

Each applicant will be required to have letters of recommendation from three individuals who are qualified to judge his past professional accomplishments and to estimate his potential as a media specialist.

Interest in a career as a media specialist

Each applicant will be required to submit a statement indicating his interest in the program and his reasons for wanting to participate.

Although previous experience as a media specialist is not a requirement for admission, individuals with such experience will be given preference — all other factors being equal. Special consideration will also be given to applicants who have professional positions as media specialists from which they can be granted leave or to which they will be appointed after receiving the professional preparation offered in the proposed program.

The final selection of participants from among eligible applicants will be made by a committee of faculty members in Instructional Development and Technology at Michigan State University.

DATES

September 18, 1972 through June 10, 1973 (Academic Year Institute, 40 weeks).

APPLICATION DEADLINE

Requests for application forms should be directed to Paul W. F. Witt, Institute Director, Instructional Media Center, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan 48823. Completed applications must be postmarked on or before June 15, 1972.

Accepted applicants and alternates will be notified no later than June 24, 1972.

Letters of Acceptance must be postmarked no later than July 3, 1972.

ACADEMIC CREDIT

Graduate credit may be earned by the participants. To obtain credit, a participant must be accepted by the Graduate School prior to the start of the Institute program.

STIPENDS

Full-time participants will receive $3500 for the academic year plus $400 for a dependent.

Tuition and enrollment fees will also be paid by the University.

HOUSING

During the academic year, the University provides modern dormitory and married housing facilities for most of its 40,000 students. These facilities will be available for the full-time participants enrolled in this Institute. These are two pertinent types of housing.

(1) Graduate dormitory rooms for which current rentals are $335 per quarter for single rooms and $282 per quarter for double rooms including board credit of of $120. (A quarter is 10 weeks.)

(2) Furnished University apartments for which current rentals are $109 and $115 per month for one- and two-bedroom apartments respectively.

REQUEST FOR APPLICATION FORMS

Dr. Paul W. F. Witt, Director
EPDA Part D Institute
Instructional Media Center
Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan 48823

Please send application materials for the EPDA Part D Institute to:

Date _____

NAME _____ Home Phone No. _____

STREET ADDRESS _____ School Phone No. _____

CITY _____ STATE _____ ZIP _____

STAFF

Paul W. F. Witt — Institute Director; Professor, College of Education; Associate Director for Instructional Development, Instructional Media Center.

Charles F. Schuller — Professor, College of Education; Director, Instructional Media Center.

Allan J. Abedor — Assistant Professor, College of Education; Assistant Director, Instructional Development Service, Educational Development Program.

Kent L. Gustafson — Associate Professor, College of Education; Assistant Director of Research and Development, Instructional Media Center.

M. Ali Issari — Associate Professor, College of Communication Arts; Head, Film Division, Instructional Media Center.

Erling S. Jorgensen — Professor, Colleges of Education and Communication Arts; Associate Director for Instructional Television Service, Instructional Media Center.

Curtis J. McCarty — Assistant Professor, College of Education.

Bruce L. Miles — Associate Director for Production and Distribution Facilities, Instructional Media Center.

James R. Nord — Assistant Professor, College of Education.

James L. Page — Professor and Director, Instructional Resources Center, College of Education.

Wilfred Veenendaal — Associate Professor, College of Education; Assistant Director of Instructional Development, Instructional Media Center.

Donald J. Wilkening — Assistant Professor, College of Education; Head, Graphics Division, Instructional Media Center.

Dr. Paul W. F. Witt, Director
EPDA Part D Institute
Instructional Media Center
Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan 48823

Place Stamp Here

PARTICIPANTS

Paul W. F. Witt
Director

EPDA PART D MEDIA INSTITUTE
1972 - 1973

Michigan State University
Instructional Media Center

Name/Address	Most Recent Position	BA/BS	MA/MS/Ed.S.
Sr. Mary Ann Brady W-717 Owen Hall Campus	Director of Media Services Edgecliff College Cincinnati, Ohio	Teachers College, Athenaeum of Ohio English/Chem. 1953	Indiana University (Ed.S.) Instructional Technology 1970
Larry P. Donahue 5695 Potter Street Haslett, Michigan	7th grade teacher Toledo, Ohio	Kent State University Elementary Education 1968	University of Toledo Curriculum and Teaching 1971
Joel B. Fleming 1804 Hamilton Road, Apt.6-A Okemos, Michigan 48864	Media Consultant to Guam Dept. of Education; Agana, Guam	University of Minnesota Broadcasting 1958	Michigan State University Television/Radio
David N. Gillmore 3242 West Holt Road Mason, Michigan 48854	Production/Operations Mgr. WGTE-TV (PBS) Toledo, Ohio	University of Toledo Educational Administr. 1960	University of Toledo English/Speech 1965
Robert D. Price 1440-C Spartan Village East Lansing, Michigan	Media Coordinator; Southwest Regional Media Center for the Deaf; New Mexico State Univ.	College of the Ozarks Phy. Ed./Soc. Science 1961	University of Wisconsin, Stout Audiovisual Communications 1971
Lawrence Redd 4519 Seaway Drive Lansing, Michigan	Producer/Director WKAR AM-FM Michigan State University	Tennessee State Univ. Speech/Drama 1964	Michigan State University Television/Radio 1971
John H. Stamper 1419-C Spartan Village East Lansing, Michigan	Curriculum Planner Hawaii English Project University of Hawaii	University of Hawaii Speech/Communication 1968	University of Hawaii Speech/Communication 1969
Paul Woodworth 1541-C Spartan Village East Lansing, Michigan	Director of Television Services; Western Illinois University	Western Michigan Univ. Television/Radio 1968	Michigan State University Television/Radio 1969

APPENDIX B

APPENDIX C

Seminar Activities

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

INSTRUCTIONAL MEDIA CENTER EAST LANSING · MICHIGAN · 48824

EPDA INSTITUTES

ED882--Seminar in
Instructional Development and Technology

SCHEDULE

1972 Fall Term

9/15	Orientation Sessions morning and afternoon.
9/22	Coffee Hour - Introduction of Institute participants to staff and students. ITV and DFS at MSU. Institute objectives, program and evaluation.
9/29	Film Production at MSU. NSMI and IRC in the College of Education.
10/6	ID at MSU; EDP and IDS at MSU; Housekeeping.
10/13	Dr. Charles F. Schuller, Director, IMC. Field trip to Prep Lab Mammalian Physiology.
10/20	Field trips to Lansing Community College and the Capital Area Career Center, Ingham Intermediate School District, Mason, MI.
10/27	Dr. Elwood E. Miller and Mr. Leslie Steen, Resource persons.
11/3	Planning for guided field experiences and future seminar activities.
11/17	De-briefing: discussion of Dean Goldhammer's remarks at last week's student-staff luncheon. Continued review of participant activities in guided field experiences and in EDP visits. Preview of visit to Oakland Community College.
12/1	Field trip to Oakland Community College.
12/4	Oakland CC field trip de-briefing. IDI Preliminary; AECT Convention Student Project; Review of lab-field experiences; adjournment for holiday recess.

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

Instructional Media Center

EPDA INSTITUTES

ED882--Seminar in
Instructional Development and Technology

SCHEDULE

Winter Term
1973

Jan. 2-6	IDI. 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. daily.
Jan. 12	Debriefing on IDI. Planning specifics for subsequent sessions. Savage pre-test to be given in the afternoon.
Jan. 19	Dr. Abedor: De-briefing on evaluation visits. Discussion of ID at MSU with reference to 9-step model. Dr. John Barson, College of Osteopathic Medicine, will be the luncheon speaker.
Jan. 26	Participation in selected instructional modules. Directed by Dr. Nord (RUP).
Feb. 2	Continuation of RUP activity. Afternoon tentatively reserved for Savage project.
Feb. 9	Continuation of RUP activity.
Feb. 16	Continuation of RUP activity.
Feb. 23	Trip to Oakland Community College.
Mar. 2	Continuation of RUP activity.
Mar. 9	Evaluation of RUP activity and instructional modules.
Mar. 16	Planning: Feed-Forward.

NOTE: As the schedule permits, Part D participants will be asked to meet to report on their guided field experiences, to explore nature of Teacher Education at MSU and to plan other sessions in lieu of proposed mini-courses which are not now feasible.

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

INSTRUCTIONAL MEDIA CENTER EAST LANSING · MICHIGAN · 48824

EPDA INSTITUTES

ED882--Seminar in
Instructional Development and Technology

SCHEDULE

1973 Spring Term

3/30	Lawrence Redd: Radio--Aware Survey; Community Action Spots; Features.
4/6	David Gillmore and Joel Fleming: ITV in Samoa and in Appalachia.
4/13	AECT Convention in Las Vegas.
4/20	De-briefing on AECT Convention. Dr. Joseph Hill to interpret cognitive maps.
4/27	Paul Woodworth: ITV at Western Illinois University. John Stamper: Time Compressed Speech and the Hawaii English Project. James Nord: DD&E Materials.
5/4	Field Trip to Western Michigan University.
5/11	Field Trip to Annual Joint Conference of the MAVA and the MASL, Grand Rapids, MI.
5/18	De-briefing on field trips.
5/25	Robert Heinich, Indiana University, guest speaker.
6/1	Final Seminar Session.
6/4-8	Final individual conferences with Institute participants.

APPENDIX D

Resource and Convocation Speakers

Michigan State University Faculty

Dr. Allan J. Abedor
Dr. Kent Gustafson
Prof. M. Ali Issari
Dr. Erling Jorgensen
Dr. Curtis J. McCarty
Dr. James R. Nord
Dr. James L. Page
Dr. Charles F. Schuller
Dr. Paul W. F. Witt

MSU Instructional Media Center Staff

Mr. Somnath Chatterjee

Visitors from Other Institutions

Dr. Amo De Bernardis
President
Portland Community College
Portland, Oregon

Dr. Elwood E. Miller
Associate Director
Bureau of Audiovisual Instruction
University of Colorado

Dr. Robert Heinich
Professor of Education
Indiana University

Dr. Joseph Hill
President
Oakland Community College
Bloomfield Hills, MI

Mr. Leslie Steen
Consultant, IMC
Lansing Public Schools
Lansing, MI

Educators Featured at College of Education Convocations

Dr. Kenneth Benne
Professor of Education
Boston University

Dr. Charles Weingartner
Professor of Education
University of South Florida
Tampa, Florida

APPENDIX E

STUDENT-STAFF LUNCHEON SPEAKERS

Fall Term

Dr. Lawrence T. Alexander
Director of Learning Service
Michigan State University

Dr. Keith Goldhammer
Dean, College of Education
Michigan State University

Prof. M. Ali Issari
Head, Film Production, IMC
Michigan State University

Dr. Elwood E. Miller
Associate Director, BAVI
University of Colorado

Mr. Robert Townsend
Instructional Media Specialist
Capital Area Career Center
Mason, Michigan

Prof. Donald Wilkening
Head, Graphics Production, IMC
Michigan State University

Winter Term

Dr. James Rust
Ombudsman
Michigan State University

Dr. John Barson
Assoc. Dean, Osteopathic
Medicine, MSU

Dr. John Fuzak
Assoc. Dean, College of
Education, MSU

Dr. Robert Brandou
Dir., Science-Math Center
Michigan State University

Dr. Jason Teoh, M.D.
Director of Medical Education
University of Malaya

Dr. Leland W. Dean
Assoc. Dean for Teacher Educ.
College of Education, MSU

Dr. Crystal Lange
Director, Nursing Education
Delta College

Ms. Dacia Van Antwerp
Training Analyst
Industrial Education
Chrysler Corporation

Spring Term

Mr. Larry De Santis
Graduate Student in ID&T
Michigan State University

Dr. Clifton R. Wharton, Jr.
President
Michigan State University

Dr. Joseph Hill
President
Oakland Community College

Prof. M. Ali Issari
Head, Film Production, IMC
Michigan State University

Dr. Robert Heinich
Professor of Education
Indiana University

Dr. John E. Dietrich
Assistant Provost
Michigan State University

APPENDIX F

Field Trips - 1972-1973

EPDA PART D Institute

Fall Term

Place	Host/Resource Person
Mammalian Physiology Prep Laboratory Michigan State Univ.	Dr. Raymond F. Johnston
Natural Science Department Lansing Community College	Dr. David Shull
Capital Area Career Center Ingham Intermediate School District, Mason, MI	Dr. Robert L. Slocum, Asst. Supt. Mr. Leo Schuch, Director
Oakland Community College Bloomfield Hills, MI	Dr. Derek Nunney, Vice Pres. for Academic Affairs

Winter Term

Oakland Community College

Spring Term

Western Michigan University Kalamazoo, MI	Dr. David W. Hessler
Joint MAVA MASL Spring Conference, Grand Rapids, MI	
Annual AECT Convention Las Vegas	

APPENDIX G

INNOVATIONS IN COLLEGE INSTRUCTION

Presented By

The Instructional Development Services
Michigan State University

January 19, 1973 -- INDIVIDUALIZED INSTRUCTION IN THE UNIVERSITY

Dr. Ben A. Green, Jr., Professor of Physics and Staff Scientist, Educational Research Center, MIT

February 9, 1973 -- EFFECTIVE GROUP INSTRUCTION BY CONTINGENCY MANAGEMENT

Dr. Jack Michael, Professor of Psychology, Western Michigan University

March 2, 1973 -- COLLEGE TEACHING TODAY: WHY WISE MEN FAIL

Dr. Marvin Ack, Director of Mental Health, Children's Health Center and Hospital, Minneapolis

March 23, 1973 -- TEACHING WITH A PURPOSE: A TROIKA OF INSTRUCTIONAL STRATEGIES

Dr. Gerald Nadler, Professor of Engineering, University of Wisconsin

Following his formal presentation, each speaker will meet informally with those who are interested to discuss further his topic.

For further information, please call Dr. L. T. Alexander, Director, MSU Learning Service (35308940).

APPENDIX H

EVALUATION INSTRUMENTS

1. Student Instructional Rating System (SIRS) Form. (One page.)

2. Means of the Numerical Indices of the Participants' Responses to Items 1 through 21 of the Student Instructional Rating System (SIRS) Form. (Two pages.)

3. Final Evaluation. (Thirteen pages.)

   NOTE: In order to facilitate comparison of the responses of the participants in this Institute with the responses of the participants in the previous Institute, the numbers of the items on this form that are identical to items on the form to which the participants in the previous Institute responded have identical numbers. Items to which it was not appropriate for the participants in this Institute to respond are marked "omit" on this form.

4. Participants' Opinions Regarding Their Achievement of Institute Objectives. (Six pages.)

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

STUDENT INSTRUCTIONAL RATING SYSTEM FORM

SA - if you strongly agree with the statement
A - if you agree with the statement
N - if you neither agree nor disagree
D - if you disagree with the statement
SD - if you strongly disagree with the statement

Please omit any of the items which do not pertain to the course that you are rating. For example, if you have had no homework assignments in this course omit (leave blanks) those items pertaining to homework. With a pencil respond to the items using the KEY →

	KEY ↓	SA	A	N	D	SD
1. The instructor was enthusiastic when presenting course material.	1.					
2. The instructor seemed to be interested in teaching.	2.					
3. The instructor's use of examples or personal experiences helped to get points across in class.	3.					
4. The instructor seemed to be concerned with whether the students learned the material.	4.					
5. You were interested in learning the course material.	5.					
6. You were generally attentive in class.	6.					
7. You felt that this course challenged you intellectually.	7.					
8. You have become more competent in this area due to this course.	8.					
9. The instructor encouraged students to express opinions.	9.					
10. The instructor appeared receptive to new ideas and others' viewpoints.	10.					
11. The student had an opportunity to ask questions.	11.					
12. The instructor generally stimulated class discussion.	12.					
13. The instructor attempted to cover too much material.	13.					
14. The instructor generally presented the material too rapidly.	14.					
15. The homework assignments were too time consuming relative to their contribution to your understanding of the course material.	15.					
16. You generally found the coverage of topics in the assigned readings too difficult.	16.					
17. The instructor appeared to relate the course concepts in a systematic manner.	17.					
18. The course was well organized.	18.					
19. The instructor's class presentations made for easy note taking.	19.					
20. The direction of the course was adequately outlined.	20.					
21. You generally enjoyed going to class.	21.					
22.	22.					
23. Instructor may insert three (3) items in these spaces.	23.					
24.	24.					

STUDENT BACKGROUND - Select the most appropriate alternative.

25. Was this course required in your degree program?	25.	
26. Was this course recommended to you by another student?	26.	
27. What is your overall GPA? (a) 1.9 or less (b) 2.0-2.2 (c) 2.3-2.7 (d) 2.8-3.3 (e) 3.4-4.5	27.	
28. How many other courses have you had in this department? (a) none (b) 1-2 (c) 3-4 (d) 5-6 (e) 7 or more	28.	
29. Instructor may insert two (2) items in this space.	29.	
30.	30.	

DO NOT WRITE BELOW THIS LINE UNLESS THIS COURSE HAS LABORATORY OR RECITATION SECTIONS

LABORATORY or RECITATION (fill in your recitation or lab number at the bottom)

31. The laboratory or recitation instructor clarified lecture material.	31.	
32. The laboratory or recitation instructor adequately prepared you for the material covered in his section.	32.	
34. You generally found the laboratories or recitations interesting.	33.	
34. Instructor may insert two (2) items in this space.	34.	
35.	35.	

IMPORTANT

WRITE and MARK in the boxes to the right your recitation or laboratory section number. → Section number 1 would be written and marked 001; section number 15 would be written and marked 015. If you do not have a recitation or lab section leave this area blank.

RECITATION OR LABORATORY SECTION NUMBER

1.			
2.			
3.			

OPTICAL SCANNING CORPORATION

STUDENT INSTRUCTIONAL RATING SYSTEM FORM (Written Comments)

One way in which an instructor can improve his class is through thoughtful student reactions. This instructor hopes to use your responses for self-examination and self-improvement. If you have any comments to make concerning the instructor or the course, please write them in the shaded area below.

DC 4248

OPSCAN FORMS, by OPTICAL SCANNING CORPORATION

Means of the Numerical Indices of the Participants' Responses to Items 1 through 21 of the Student Instructional Rating System (SIRS) Form

N = 5

Item		Mean
1.	The instructor was enthusiastic when presenting course material.	1.6
2.	The instructor seemed to be interested in teaching.	1.0
3.	The instructor's use of examples or personal experience helped to get points across in class.	1.2
4.	The instructor seemed to be concerned with whether the students learned the material.	1.2
5.	You were interested in learning the course material.	1.6
6.	You were generally attentive in class.	1.6
7.	You felt that this course challenged you intellectually.	1.6
8.	You have become more competent in this area due to this course.	1.4
9.	The instructor encouraged students to express opinions.	1.6
10.	The instructor appeared receptive to new ideas and others' viewpoints.	1.6
11.	The student had an opportunity to ask questions.	1.2
12.	The instructor generally stimulated class discussion.	1.4
13.	The instructor attempted to cover too much materials.	3.8
14.	The instructor generally presented the material too rapidly.	4.2
15.	The homework assignments were too time consuming relative to their contribution to your understanding of the course material.	4.5
16.	You generally found the coverage of topics in the assigned readings too difficult.	4.6
17.	The instructor appeared to relate the course concepts in a systematic manner.	1.8

Item		Mean
18.	The course was well organized.	1.8
19.	The instructor's class presentations made for easy note taking.	2.5
20.	The direction of the course was adequately outlined.	2.2
21.	You generally enjoyed going to class.	1.8

NOTE: It is noted that the SIRS form is much more appropriate for student evaluation of the typical undergraduate course than a doctoral seminar. In fact, many of its items are of questionable appropriateness for the latter purpose.

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY
EPDA TITLE 5-D MEDIA INSTITUTE
1972-73

FINAL EVALUATION

PART I

Using the following scale, please evaluate your experiences as an EPDA Title 5-D Institute participant (i.e., doctoral student) at MSU.

1 Extremely valuable
2 Of considerable value
3 Of some value
4 Of little value
5 Of no value

Please comment, specify the nature of the value received and/or offer suggestions as you deem appropriate in the space below each item.

If you have had no experience with a given item, please so indicate by writing NE in the value column.

N = 8

* * * * *

	Item	Value = $\bar{X}$
1.	Your total experience in your doctoral program.	1.25
2.	Your associations with your advisor.	1.5
3.	Your associations with your guidance committee.	2.6
4.	Your associations with the institute director.	1.38
5.	Your associations with the administrative assistant.	3.0
6.	Your formal conferences (evaluative and other) with the director.	1.88

	Item	Value = $\overline{X}$
7.	Omit	
8.	Omit	
9.	Your associations with the institute secretaries.	1.75
10.	Your associations with the professors in ID&T.	1.75
11.	Your associations with the IMC administrative staff.	2.38
12.	Your associations with the IMC secretarial and technical staff.	3.0
13.	Your participation in planning ED882 seminar and other institute activities.	2.38
14.	Your participation in the "brown-bag" planning sessions.	2.38
15.	Your work in ID&T courses.	2.5
16.	Your work in the institute seminar (ED882).	2.0
17.	Your work in courses in learning theory and instructional design.	2.5
18.	Your work in courses in the broad fields of education.	2.63

Item	Value = $\bar{X}$
19. Your work in courses in your cognate area.	2.13
20. Your work in other courses. (Please specify the courses.)	3.5
21. List the numbers and titles of the three best courses you have taken at MSU.	
22. List the numbers and titles of the three courses you have taken at MSU of least value to you.	
22-a. Your participation in Abedor's on-site visits to EDP projects.	2.29
22-b. Your experience in evaluation of RUP packages.	3.38
22-c. Your experience in cognative stype mapping.	2.0
22-d. Your experience in the Savage Research Project.	3.0
22-e. Your experience as a reporter in Ed 882 of your professional experience.	3.0
22-f. Your experience as a receiver of these reports.	2.38

Item	Value = $\overline{X}$
23. Your experience with special resource people:	
a. Omit	
b. Your experiences with:	
(1) Woodie Miller	2.8
(2) Leslie Steen	3.13
(3) Amo de Bernardis	2.38
(4) Robert Heinich	1.8
c. Your experiences with:	
(1) Allan J. Abedor	1.8
(2) Kent Gustafson	2.5
(3) M. Ali Issari	3.39
(4) Erling Jorgensen	3.0
(5) Curtis McCarty	2.8
(6) James R. Nord	2.13
(7) James L. Page	3.0
(8) Charles F. Schuller	2.14
(9) Paul W. F. Witt	1.5
d. Your experiences with the people on the IDS Lecture Series:	
(1) Ben A. Green (MIT)	3.0
(2) Jack Michael (WMU)	2.43
(3) Marvin Ack (Menninger Found.)	2.4
(4) Gerald Nadler (U. of Wis.)	2.0

$\overline{X}$

e. Your experiences with guest lecturers at the College of Education:

(1) Charles Weingartner 2.0

(2) Kenneth Benne 4.0*

*ONLY ONE RATING

Item — Value

24. Your guided field experiences:
(List and evaluate each.)

Situation	Your role	

What do you consider your major achievements in your field experiences to be?

What were the principal values you received from your field experiences?

What were the inadequacies, weaknesses, or disappointments in your field experiences?

Other comments and suggestions:

Item			Value = $\bar{X}$
25. Your professional experiences outside of the institute but related to your professional area of specialization. (Please list and evaluate.)			
Activity	Your role	Specific values to you	
_____	_____	_____	____
_____	_____	_____	____
_____	_____	_____	____

(If you need additional space, use back of sheet.)

26. Your experiences on field trips:		
a.	Trip to MSU Mammalian physiology laboratory.	2.75
b.	Trip to Capitol Area Career Center	2.13
c.	Trip to Lansing Community College.	2.0
d.	Trip to MASL/MAVA.	3.0
e.	Trip to Western Michigan University	1.5
f.	Trip to AECT.	1.25
g.	Trip to Oakland Community College	1.63
h.	Other. (Please specify.)	____

	Item	Value = $\bar{X}$
	What were the major values of the field trips to you?	
	If you have negative reactions to the field trips, what are they?	
27.	Your participation in the IDI in January, 1973.	1.5
28.	Your participation in program development activities.	2.13
29.	Omit.	
30.	Your attendance at the student-staff Friday luncheons.	2.13
31.	Your participation in planning and producing the presentation for AECT.	2.43
32.	Omit	
33.	Your reading of the MEDIA NEWS.	3.0
34.	Your social activities related to the institute.	1.88

PART II

Using the following scale, please rate the appropriateness of the objectives and program of the institute and the adequacy of space, facilities, resources and services which have been available to you.

1 Excellent
2 Good
3 Average
4 Fair
5 Poor

X

If you did not use any of the facilities, resources or services, please so indicate by writing DNU in the column for the ratings.

	Item	Rating
1.	The appropriateness of the objectives of the institute.	1.63
2.	The appropriateness of your doctoral program.	1.5
3.	The appropriateness of the common activities and experiences for institute participants.	1.88
4.	The adequacy of the content of the brochure announcing the institute.	1.63
5.	The accuracy of the brochure content: objectives, program, eligibility requirements, credit, stipends, housing, staff and deadlines.	1.38

	Item	$\bar{X}$ Rating
6.	The effectiveness of the communications you received before the institute began.	1.0
7.	The adequacy of the orientation to the institute which you received.	1.5
8.	The clarity of the requirements.	1.88
9.	The flexibility of the requirements.	2.00
10.	The effectiveness of the advisement provided by the director.	1.5
11.	The workroom.	2.25
12.	The library in the workroom.	1.5
13.	Omit.	
14.	The production room.	3.5
15.	The production equipment and facilities.	3.5
16.	Adequacy and accessibility of materials. (I.e., film, paper, transparencies, etc.)	3.75

$\overline{X}$

Item	Rating
17. The copier.	2.25
18. The coffee service	2.5
19. The resources of the IRC, College of Education.	2.13
20. The services of the IRC, College of Education.	2.25
21. The services of the IMC.	1.88
22. The services of ITV.	2.5
23. The resources of MSU's Main Library.	1.88
24. The services of MSU's Main Library.	2.0
25. The services of Dr. Porter's research advisement staff.	1.0
26. The services of MSU's Computer Center.	2.0
27. Other: (Please list and rate.)	____

PART III

1. What are the major values you have received from your participation in the institute?

2. What expectations did you have when you entered the institute which are still unfulfilled?

3. What are your major recommendations as to what should be done in another institute to insure its success?

4. What is your principal professional goal (i.e., type of position and work) at this point in time?

5. Is your current principal professional goal different from the one you had when you entered the institute? Yes _____; No_____.

   If your answer is yes, please indicate the nature of the change and the reasons therefor.

If your answer is no, please indicate why there has been no change in your goal.

6. Please indicate the stage at which you are in your doctoral program.

Course work? _____

Comprehensive Examination in major? _____

Comprehensive Examination in cognate? _____

Dissertation? _____

Oral Examination? _____

Term in which you anticipate completing all requirements for the degree?

_____

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY
EPDA TITLE 5-D MEDIA INSTITUTE
1972-73

Participants' Opinions Regarding Their Achievement of Institute Objectives

The purpose of the Institute program was to prepare instructional media specialists to work in schools and teacher training institutions. The program was designed so special emphasis would be given to the work of the instructional media specialist in preservice and inservice teacher training, vocational education, and the education of the disadvantaged from both rural and urban areas.

The five major objectives of the institute program which were the principal guidelines for the development of institute activities are listed below. A partial listing of sub-objectives for each major objective is also given.

* * * * *

DIRECTIONS: Please indicate your opinion of your level of achievement of each major objective and each sub-objective at the time of your entry into the institute and at the present time as you leave the institute by writing the appropriate number (see the meanings of the numbers given below) in the proper spaces following each objective and sub-objective. (If you believe you have achieved additional objectives or sub-objectives, please list them and indicate your opinion of your levels of achievement.)

The meanings of the numbers are:

1. You have achieved the objective rather completely.
2. You have achieved the objective to a considerable degree.
3. You have achieved the objective only moderately well.
4. You have achieved the objective only partially.
5. You have not achieved the objective at all.

EXAMPLE:

The people who complete the two-year institute program will be able:	Your Opinion of Your Level of Achievement at Entry	Exit
0. To address Professor Kent Gustafson as "Gus."	5	2

EPDA TITLE 5-D MEDIA INSTITUTE
Students' opinions of their achievement
of institute objectives

$N = 8$

The people who complete the two-year institute program will be able:	Your Opinion of Your Level of Achievement at Entry $\overline{X}_{EN}$	Exit $\overline{X}_{EX}$	GAIN $\overline{X}_{G}$
1. To utilize systems analysis and design in identifying and studying instructional problems, in establishing objectives, in developing new teaching strategies and materials for problem solutions and in designing and applying appropriate instructional media in the process.	3.5	2.13	1.37
1.1 To define instructional development and describe how it takes place.	4.0	2.0	2.0
1.2 To formulate a plan and procedures for establishing an instructional development program in a specific school or college and to identify ways and means for the development and support of this program.	4.38	2.88	1.5
1.3 To define systems analysis and systems design; and to describe the component parts of a system and the relationship and interactions of these parts.	4.0	2.38	1.62
1.4 To describe how systems analysis and design can be used in instructional development.	3.75	2.0	1.75
1.5 To identify the types and sources of information needed to describe and analyze instructional problems; and to collect this information in a specific situation, organize and evaluate it, and use it appropriately and effectively.	3.75	2.63	1.12
1.6 To describe the nature, characteristics and functions of behavioral objectives in teaching and learning; and to develop behavioral objectives for the achievement of specific goals with given groups of learners in specific situations.	2.63	1.38	1.25
1.7 To identify and describe a wide variety of instructional strategies, to indicate their respective values and limitations, and to describe instructional situations and purposes for which each may be suited.	3.0	1.88	1.12
1.8	—	—	—

		ENTRY $\bar{X}_{EN}$	EXIT $\bar{X}_{EX}$	GAIN $\bar{X}_G$
1.9		—	—	
1.10		—	—	
2.	To evaluate and use effectively all types of media in given instructional settings to bring about desired, specific changes in the behavior of learners.	3.5	2.33	1.17
2.1	To identify desired learner outcomes.	2.88	1.63	1.25
2.2	To determine learner characteristics.	3.25	2.5	0.75
2.3	To identify a relevant instructional setting for the expected learning outcomes.	3.29	2.0	1.29
2.4	To define the mediational system.	3.38	2.25	1.13
2.5	To plan the instructional strategy.	3.25	1.75	1.5
2.6	To assemble required instructional materials and equipment.	3.0	1.88	1.12
2.7	To prepare learners to interact effectively with instructional media.	2.5	1.75	0.75
2.8	To utilize media appropriately in instruction in order to produce desired learning outcomes.	2.75	1.88	0.87
2.9	To employ assessment techniques to determine the effectiveness of the mediated instruction.	3.63	2.13	1.5
2.10		—	—	
2.11		—	—	
2.12		—	—	
3.	To translate theory and empirical evidence about learners, subject matter, mediating forms, settings and techniques into instructional systems specifications.	3.75	2.75	1.0

		ENTRY $\bar{x}$	EXIT $\bar{x}$	GAIN $\bar{x}$
3.1	To clarify and analyze specific behavioral objectives.	2.75	1.63	1.12
3.2	To define learners' characteristics - social, cultural, intellectual, achievement, etc.	3.5	2.5	1.0
3.3	To determine specifications for the instructional setting.	3.63	2.25	1.38
3.4	To detail instructional strategies.	3.25	2.25	1.0
3.5	To select appropriate mediating forms.	3.25	2.13	1.12
3.6	To manage the design operations.	3.5	2.13	1.37
3.7		—	—	
3.8		—	—	
3.9		—	—	
4.	To design and conduct evaluation studies to determine the pedagogical as well as cost effectiveness of teaching strategies and instructional materials.	4.38	3.25	1.13
4.1	To identify criteria and procedures for evaluating all types of instructional media; and to utilize these criteria and procedures in the evaluation of specific examples of each type of medium.	3.88	3.0	0.88
4.2	To design evaluation studies of specific instructional systems to determine their pedagogical effectiveness and to make appropriate modifications in the system.	3.88	3.0	0.88
4.3	To design studies of specific instructional systems to determine their monetary costs.	3.75	2.88	0.87
4.4		—	—	
4.5		—	—	

4.6

	ENTRY	EXIT	GAIN
	$\overline{X}_{EN}$	$\overline{X}_{EX}$	$\overline{X}_{G}$
5. To work effectively with teachers and with trainers of teachers on the planning of teaching strategies and the selection, design and use of media.	2.88	2.0	0.88
5.1 To confer with an individual teacher to identify instructional problems, to offer constructive suggestions for the solution of these problems, and to provide information, materials and help useful in implementing selected solutions.	2.75	1.88	0.87
5.2 To participate effectively in meetings, conferences and workshops for teachers concerned with the improvement of instruction, e.g., to make presentations, to participate in panel discussions, to respond to questions, etc.	3.13	2.0	1.13
5.3	—	—	
5.4	—	—	
5.5	—	—	
6.	—	—	
7.	—	—	
8.	—	—	

COMMENTS:

APPENDIX I

MSU REF: 71-0101

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20202
EDUCATIONAL PERSONNEL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS
BUDGET AND FINANCIAL REPORT

FORM APPROVED
BUDGET BUREAU NO. 51-R0394

GRANT/CONTRACT NUMBER
OEG-0-72-4376

TITLE OF PROGRAM REPORTED
An Institute for the Advanced Professional Preparation of Educational Media Specialists

NAME AND ADDRESS OF INSTITUTION (City, State, ZIP Code)
Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan 48824

	A. DIRECT COST-ADMINISTRATIVE & INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF SALARIES		BUDGETED	EXPENDED	BALANCE
1	DIRECTOR		5,313.00	5,250.00	63.00
2	SECRETARIAL AND CLERICAL		1,815.00	2,272.35	(457.35)
3	OTHER ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORTING STAFF		4,125.00	4,199.94	(74.94)
4	FULL-TIME INSTRUCTORS	NO.	-0-	-0-	-0-
5	PART-TIME INSTRUCTORS	NO.	-0-	-0-	-0-
6	LABORATORY ASSISTANTS	NO.	-0-	-0-	-0-
7	INSTRUCTIONAL ASSISTANTS	NO. 1	1,800.00	1,500.00	300.00
8	LECTURERS AND/OR CONSULTANTS	NO. 2	300.00	200.00	100.00
9	*SUBTOTAL FOR SALARIES (Sum of Lines 1 through 8)*		13,353.00	13,422.29	(69.29)
	B. OTHER DIRECT COSTS				
10	EMPLOYEE SERVICES AND BENEFITS		1,689.00	1,234.54	454.46
11	TRAVEL		3,190.00	2,636.75	553.25
12	OFFICE SUPPLIES, DUPLICATING, PUBLICITY, COMMUNICATIONS		2,160.00	1,237.01	922.99
13	INSTRUCTIONAL SUPPLIES, ETC.		2,266.00	1,475.44	790.56
14	REQUIRED FEES		80.00	396.80	(316.80)
15	EQUIPMENT RENTAL AND/OR DEPRECIATION *(if applicable)*		1,617.00	1,982.15	(365.15)
16	*SUBTOTAL FOR OTHER DIRECT COSTS (Sum of Lines 10 thru 15)*		11,002.00	8,962.69	2,039.31
17	TOTAL DIRECT COSTS *(Sum of Lines 9 and 16)*		24,355.00	22,384.98	1,970.02
	C. STIPEND SUPPORT *(Federal participants)*				
18	PARTICIPANTS PAID	NO. 8	28,000.00	28,000.64	(.64)
19	DEPENDENTS PAID	NO. 16	6,400.00	6,399.36	.64
20	TOTAL STIPEND SUPPORT *(Sum of Lines 18 and 19)*		34,400.00	34,400.00	-0-
21	TOTAL DIRECT AND STIPEND COSTS *(Sum of Lines 17 and 20)*		58,755.00	56,784.98	1,970.02
22	INDIRECT COSTS *(8 percent of Line 21)*		4,700.00	4,542.80	157.20
23	GRAND TOTAL *(Sum of Lines 21 and 22)*		63,455.00	61,327.78	2,127.22

TYPED NAME OF DIRECTOR	SIGNATURE OF DIRECTOR	DATE SIGNED
Dr. Paul W. F. Witt	Paul W. F. Witt	3-28-74
TYPED NAME AND TITLE OF FINANCIAL OFFICER Howard G. Grider, Director Research & Contract Administration	SIGNATURE OF FINANCIAL OFFICER	DATE SIGNED

OE FORM 7203 5-68 REPLACES OE FORM 4011, WHICH IS OBSOLETE.